

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 977(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 977(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 977.

**IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FIFTH APPELLATE DISTRICT**

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

EDWARD HANAWALT,

Defendant and Appellant.

F039820

(Super. Ct. No. SC082027A)

OPINION

THE COURT*

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Kern County. Arthur E. Wallace, Judge.

John L. Staley, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

Bill Lockyer, Attorney General, Robert R. Anderson, Chief Assistant Attorney General, Jo Graves, Assistant Attorney General, and Carlos A. Martinez, Deputy Attorney General, for Plaintiff and Respondent.

-ooOoo-

* Before Wiseman, Acting P.J., Levy, J., and Gomes, J.

Appellant, Edward William Hanawalt, pled no contest to forgery (Pen. Code, § 470), possession of a counterfeited note (Pen. Code, § 475), possession of paper for counterfeiting (Pen. Code, § 480), and possession for sale of methamphetamine (Health & Saf. Code, § 11378).¹ On May 8, 2001, the court sentenced Hanawalt to the mitigated term of 16 months on each count with the terms to run concurrent to each other. Subsequently, the Department of Corrections advised the court that the mitigated term for violating Penal Code section 480 was two years. On January 7, 2002, the court sentenced Hanawalt to the mitigated term of two years on his conviction for violating Penal Code section 480 and concurrent 16-month terms on each of the three remaining counts.

Hanawalt's appellate counsel has filed a brief which summarizes the facts, with citations to the record, raises no issues, and asks this court to independently review the record. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.) Hanawalt has not responded to this court's invitation to submit additional briefing.

Following independent review of the record we find that no reasonably arguable factual or legal issues exist.

The judgment is affirmed.

¹ Appellant's request for judicial notice of the record in his prior appeal (F038638) is hereby granted.